

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 47-49 and 51-54 are currently pending
- Claim 51 is canceled herein
- Claims 47, 49 and 54 are amended herein

**[0003]** Support for the amendments to claims 47, 49 and 51 is found in the specification at least at page 20, line 21 though page 22, line 16.

### **Cited Documents**

**[0004]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Knee: Knee, U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892
- Throckmorton: Throckmorton, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,818,441

### **Claims 47-49 and 51-54 Are Patentable over Knee in view of Throckmorton**

**[0005]** Claims 47-49 and 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Knee in view of Throckmorton. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

### **Independent Claim 47**

**[0006]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 47 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest the claimed element, namely “wherein the associated additional URLs are prioritized and displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the associated additional URLs comprises monitoring the user’s usage pattern of the associated additional URLs”

**[0007]** As pointed out by the Examiner, Throckmorton does provide a Web browser interface which allows for a user to enter the URL of interest in the “Address” box to display the Web page located at the address. (See Office Action, page 4). However, Throckmorton does not then teach that the associated additional URLs are prioritized and displayed within an EPG field associated the particular program.

**[0008]** Additionally, Knee does not prioritize the associated additional URLs by monitoring the user’s usage pattern of the associated additional URLs. Instead, as the Examiner noted in rejecting claim 51, Knee teaches that the screens may be configured according to the user’s preferences. (See Office Action, page 6). As explained in Knee, these preferences are determined by keeping track of channels and services more frequently accessed to provide more information tailored to the viewer’s preferences, Knee is silent as to tracking the usage pattern of the user associated additional URLs . (See Knee, col. 43, lines 7-17)

**[0009]** Consequently, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

#### Dependent Claim 48

**[0010]** Claim 48 ultimately depends from independent claim 47. As discussed above, claim 47 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 48 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

#### Independent Claim 49

**[0011]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 49 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest the claimed element, namely “wherein the plurality of target specifications is prioritized and displayed within a supplemental content field associated with the program within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the plurality of target specifications comprises monitoring the viewer’s usage pattern of the target specification.” As discussed previously with regard to claim 47, these additional elements are not taught. For at least these reasons discussed previously, the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 49.

**[00010]** Consequently, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 52 and 53

**[0012]** Claims 52 and 53 ultimately depend from independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claims 52 and 53 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, these claims may also be allowable for the additional features that they recite.

Independent Claim 54

**[0013]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 54 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest the claimed element, namely “wherein the entered hyperlinks are displayed within an EPG Field associated with the particular program or channel within the EPG, wherein prioritizing the entered hyperlinks comprises monitoring the user’s usage pattern of the hyperlinks.” As discussed previously with regard to claim 47, these additional elements are not taught. For at least these reasons discussed previously, the cited art fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 54.

**[0014]** Consequently, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

**[0015]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-05-12  
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leeheyas.com; 509-944-4715)  
Registration No. 59090